



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/742,687	12/20/2000	Gal Almog	176/01922	5553

26418 7590 12/22/2004

REED SMITH, LLP  
ATTN: PATENT RECORDS DEPARTMENT  
599 LEXINGTON AVENUE, 29TH FLOOR  
NEW YORK, NY 10022-7650

EXAMINER
----------

STIMPAK, JOHNNA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3623

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/742,687

Applicant(s)

ALMOG ET AL.

Examiner

Johnna R Stimpak

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 October 2004.  
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) 23-28 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 and 29-32 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 December 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/08/04.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a first office action upon examination of application number 09/742,687. Applicant has elected claims 1-22 and 29-32. The claims have been examined on the merits discussed below.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. **Claims 8 and 16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Specifically, it is not clear how this limitation is applied to an applicant with no salary history, i.e., a college graduate with no employment.

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. **Claim 16** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, it is not clear how the attributes affect the graph of the average salary. Every applicant has differentiating attributes, whether it be their hometown, education, work history, etc, therefore, as claimed, the limitation is directed to graphing the salary of all applicants. Clarification is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. **Claims 1-9, 12-15, 19-22 and 29-31** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a and e) as being anticipated by McGovern et al, US 5,978,768.

As per **claim 1**, McGovern et al teaches storing a database including a plurality of job openings (column 9, lines 27-40 – position information is entered into the system and stored); providing a worker record which includes one or more fields describing a worker and one or more fields describing a position desired by the worker (column 13, lines 26-40 – job seeker enters information such as type of position, salary requirements, location, etc.); and automatically determining by a processor, for at least one of the records in the job opening database, whether the job opening in the record matches the position desired by the worker and whether the worker description matches the job opening in the record (column 13, lines 26-40 – the computer system searches the list of positions to determine if a match exists between any one of the positions and information entered by the job seeker and a list of matching positions is displayed).

As per **claim 2**, McGovern et al teaches displaying data from one or more records of the job opening database which were determined to match the position desired by the worker and to

Art Unit: 3623

which the worker description matches (column 13, lines 26-40 – the computer system searches the list of positions to determine if a match exists between any one of the positions and information entered by the job seeker and a list of matching positions is displayed).

As per **claim 3**, McGovern et al teaches displaying the data from one or more records comprises displaying each record along with an indication of an attitude of an employer generating the job opening record toward the worker record (column 17, lines 44-58 – employer can rate or score applicant resumes and is displayed as a scoring mark next to the resume).

As per **claim 4**, McGovern et al teaches the indication of the attitude of the at least one employer comprises an indication of whether the description of the worker was viewed by the at least one employer (column 17, lines 44-58 – employer can rate or score applicant resumes and is displayed as a scoring mark next to the resume – inherently if the resume is scored, it was viewed by at least one employer).

As per **claim 5**, McGovern et al teaches the one or more fields describing a position desired by the worker comprises a field that states a salary range desired by the worker (column 13, lines 26-40 – job seeker enters information such as type of position, salary requirements, location, etc.).

As per **claim 6**, McGovern et al teaches storing a database including a plurality of records of worker profiles (column 17, lines 10-22 – worker resumes are stored in a database); providing a description of a job opening (column 9, lines 27-40 – position information is entered into the system and stored); storing the description of the job opening in a job opening database (column 9, lines 27-40 – position information is entered into the system and stored); and automatically determining by a processor, for at least one of the records in the worker database, whether the

Art Unit: 3623

worker profile in the record matches the description of the job opening (column 13, lines 26-40 – the computer system searches the list of positions to determine if a match exists between any one of the positions and information entered by the job seeker and a list of matching positions is displayed).

As per **claim 7**, McGovern et al teaches automatically providing by the processor suggested changes in the description of the job opening such that the description matches a desired set of one or more records (column 10, lines 27-46 – hiring contact can edit the position description).

As per **claim 8**, McGovern et al teaches storing the worker database comprises storing a database in which at least some of the records include a salary received by the worker represented by the record (column 15, lines 10-19 – worker record includes salary requirements).

As per **claim 9**, McGovern et al teaches storing the worker database comprises storing records which include values for a predetermined set of fields (column 13, lines 26-40 – job seeker enters information such as type of position, salary requirements, location, etc.) and providing the description of the job opening comprises providing values for fields compatible to the predetermined set of fields.(column 9, lines 27-34 –position is entered which includes the title, category and a brief or detailed description which inherently would include salary and/or location).

As per **claim 12**, McGovern et al teaches determining for at least one of the records whether the worker profile in the record matches the job opening description comprises determining which of a plurality of the records match the job opening description (column 17,

Art Unit: 3623

lines 23-42 – hiring contact can select any number of resumes that match the criteria – these resumes are then viewed and scored by the hiring contact).

As per **claim 13**, McGovern et al teaches providing a list of the workers represented by the matching records to an employer (column 17, lines 1-22 – the records of the matching applicant are provided to the employer and stored).

As per **claim 14**, McGovern et al teaches selecting the employer workers who are of interest to the employer, and indicating to the selected workers that they have been selected by the employer (column 18, lines 11-23 – hiring contact can send an email to the candidate including a message such as a form rejection letter – inherently this message could also include an indication of being selected by the employer).

As per **claim 15**, McGovern et al teaches indicating to the selected workers comprises marking a job opening description of the employer with a special indication in displaying lists of job opening descriptions to the selected workers (column 16, lines 14-25 – the system send the applicant a message such as an email with the names of the positions and corresponding companies to which the applicants resume is a match).

As per **claim 19**, McGovern et al teaches providing a different description of a job opening responsive to the determination and repeating the determining with the provided different description (column 10, lines 27-46 – hiring contact can edit the position description).

As per **claim 20**, McGovern et al teaches descriptions of the job openings in the job opening database comprise a plurality of fields and wherein the different description of a job opening is different from the previously provided description in substantially only one field (column 10, lines 27-46 - hiring contact can edit the position description; inherently the

Art Unit: 3623

description would be different from the previously provided description depending on the changes made – the job description includes storage of position location – if this position is available in another location, the only difference between the two position listings would be the location field).

As per **claim 21**, McGovern et al teaches displaying data from one or more worker records that were determined to match the job opening description (column 17, lines 1-22 – the records of the matching applicant are provided to the employer and stored).

As per **claim 22**, McGovern et al teaches notifying the workers represented by the one or more records from which the data was displayed that the data was displayed (column 18, lines 11-22 – the candidate can be emailed with a notification that their resume was looked at).

As per **claim 29**, McGovern et al teaches storing a database including a plurality of job openings (column 9, lines 27-40 – position information is entered into the system and stored); providing a worker record which includes one or more fields describing a worker (column 13, lines 26-40 – job seeker enters information such as type of position, salary requirements, location, etc.); and displaying information from one or more opening records comprises displaying each record along with an indication of an attitude of an employer generating the job opening record toward the worker record (column 17, lines 44-58 – employer can rate or score applicant resumes and is displayed as a scoring mark next to the resume).

As per **claim 30**, McGovern et al teaches displaying the information comprises displaying information from at least one record along with an indication that the record was viewed by the employer (column 17, lines 44-58 – employer can rate or score applicant resumes



Art Unit: 3623

and is displayed as a scoring mark next to the resume – inherently if the resume is scored, it was viewed by at least one employer).

As per **claim 31**, McGovern et al teaches displaying the information comprises displaying information from at least one record along with an indication that the employer is interested in meeting the worker (column 18, lines 11-23 – hiring contact can send an email to the candidate including a message such as a form rejection letter – inherently this message could also include an indication of being selected by the employer).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. **Claims 10, 16 and 32** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGovern et al, US 5,978,768.

As per **claim 10**, McGovern et al does not explicitly teach providing the description of the job opening comprises providing range values for one or more of the compatible fields, however it is old and well known in the art of job posting websites to include salary ranges for job postings. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include range values for job opening description fields in McGovern et al to clarify the exact requirements or offerings of the job posting. By providing range values, for example, for salaries, the system would weed out applicants who require salaries outside of the range.

As per **claim 16**, McGovern et al teaches gathering applicant data (i.e., attributes) from their resumes. It is old and well known to collect a job applicant's salary history along with work history to evaluate their fit into the job position. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to graph the average salary of the matching records as graphing is a well known tool to display data in a user-friendly manner.

As per **claim 32**, McGovern et al teaches displaying information according to the attitude of the employer (column 17, lines 44-58 – employer can rate or score applicant resumes and is displayed as a scoring mark next to the resume) but does not explicitly teach displaying the information comprises displaying information in different colors according to the attitude of the employer. However it is old and well known to color-code indicating marks as a way to differentiate between the marks. For instance it would have been obvious to indicate the attitude of the employers in McGovern et al, in Figure 31, with colors such as a green star (meaning go ahead with this applicant), a red X (meaning stop – no longer interested in this applicant). The addition of color-coding to the McGovern et al system would allow for a more user-friendly system since colors are more eye-catching than just symbols alone.

10. **Claims 11, 17 and 18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGovern et al, in view of Puram et al, US 6,289,340.

As per **claim 11**, McGovern et al teaches providing the description of the job opening but does not explicitly teach stating a level of importance for one or more of the compatible fields. Puram teaches providing the importance or priority of the skill for the position. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for McGovern et al to include stating the level of

Art Unit: 3623

importance for the job skills since this would allow for a more precise match between job description and candidate information.

As per **claim 17**, McGovern et al does not explicitly teaches determining for at least one of the records whether the worker profile in the record matches the job opening description comprises selecting a predetermined number of records that most closely match the job opening description. Puram teaches a search returning a specific number of matching candidates (column 7, lines 21-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include selecting a predetermined number of records that most closely match the job opening description. Since McGovern et al is directed to selecting the best candidate to fill an open position, it would have been obvious to modify McGovern et al in order to assure the best possible candidate will be chosen to fill the job position.

As per **claim 18**, McGovern et al teaches determining for at least one of the records whether the worker profile in the record matches the job opening description but does not explicitly teach setting a similarity range to the job opening description such that records falling in the similarity range are considered matching the job opening description. Puram teaches scoring the candidate's skills and only returning those candidates who fall within a specified score without exceeded the maximum score. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a similarity range to ensure the best candidate would be selected to fill an open position. It would have been obvious to modify McGovern et al in order to assure the best possible candidate will be chosen.

Art Unit: 3623

***Conclusion***

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 6,567,784 – Bukow – method and apparatus for matching projects and workers

US 5,197,004 – Sobotka et al – method and apparatus for automatic categorization of applicants from resumes

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Johnna R Stimpak whose telephone number is 703-305-4566.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on 703-305-9643. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JS  
12/20/04

  
TARIQ R. HAFIZ  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600